IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR

MONDAY, THE 30TH JULY 2007 / 8TH SRAVANA 1929

RP.No. 587 of 2007(B)

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT WPC.3165/2007 Dated 15/02/2007
.....

REVIEW PETITIONERS/RESPONDENTS
----

1. STATE OF KERALA, REP. BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, REVENUE DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. THE COMMISSIONER, LAND REVENUE, DEPARTMENT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

3. THE ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONER, LAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT, COMMISSIONERATE OF LAND REVENUE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI. P.NANDAKUMAR

RESPONDENTS: PETITIONER

GIRIJA, VILLAGE ASSISTANT, PUTHENCHIRA VILLAGE OFFICE, MUKUNDAPURAM TALUK, THRISSUR DIST.

BY ADV. SRI.ELVIN PETER P.J.
SRI.C.X.ANTONY BENEDICT

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 30/07/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

K. BALAKRISHNAN NAIR, J.

R.P. NO.587/2007 IN

W.P.(C) No.3165 of 2007-B

ORDER

The respondents are the review petitioners. The writ petitioner is the respondent.

2. The respondent writ petitioner was promoted as Deputy Tahsildar by Ext.P9 order dated 18.7.2005. When the said order was not implemented and consequential benefits not granted, the writ petition was filed. This Court ordered to promote and post her as Deputy Tahsildar within two weeks and grant all monetary benefits due to her in accordance with law within two months. This review petition is filed, stating that the petitioner while working in the Rural Development Department was reverted as L.D. Clerk in the Revenue Department on 6.5.2005. Therefore, she could not have been promoted as Deputy Tahsildar by Ext.P9 on 18.7.2005 without her being placed in the intermediate post of U.D. Clerk/Special Village Officer.

3. The respondents do not have a case that the petitioner's turn did not arise for promotion to the post of Deputy Tahsildar on

18.7.2005, if the promotions due to the petitioner are granted in her absence, in the light of Rule 8, Part II of K.S. & S.S.R. Therefore, there is nothing wrong with Ext.P9 order or the direction of this Court to implement it. Accordingly, the R.P is dismissed.

K. BALAKRISHNAN NAIR,
JUDGE.

30th July, 2007.
nm.